



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,678	07/13/2001	Umair A. Khan	CLICP011	4591
28875	7590	06/21/2005	EXAMINER	
Zilka-Kotab, PC P.O. BOX 721120 SAN JOSE, CA 95172-1120			DUONG, OANH L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/905,678

Applicant(s)

KHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Oanh Duong

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/09/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

#### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 4 and 19 objected to because of the following informalities: the feature "can" in claim 4 line 2, and in claim 19 line 15 should not be used in the claims

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the second habitat" in lines 15-16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 5-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Timmons (US 6,735,586 B2) in view of Borger et al. (Borger) (US 2002/0123334 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Timmons teaches a method for network-based information management (abstract), comprising the steps of:

initiating a first habitat having markers utilized for identifying information selected by a user (col.2 lines 9-19);

retrieving the information associated with the markers (col.2 lines 9-19);

displaying the selected information on an information screen of the first habitat utilizing a network (col. 2 lines 1-19 and col.. 3 lines 47-67);

allowing a plurality of users to view the information screen of the first habitat (col. 2 lines 9-11 and col. 9 lines 41-55).

Timmons does not explicitly teach allowing the first habitat to send a request to a second habitat for desired information and access the second habitat for retrieving the requested information from the second habitat, the second habitat sending information matching the request directly to the first habitat.

Borger teaches allowing the first habitat to send a request to a second habitat for desired information and access the second habitat for retrieving the requested information from the second habitat (i.e., the first server sends a request to a second server for content, abstract and page 4 paragraph 46), the second habitat sending information matching the request directly to the first habitat (i.e., the second server sends content having a format specified by the markup tag to the first server, page 5 paragraphs 50-52).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Timmons to include allowing the first habitat to send a request to a second habitat for desired information and access the second habitat for retrieving the requested information from the second habitat, the second habitat sending information matching the request directly to the first habitat as taught by Borger because it would enable content to be dynamically inserted into web document quickly and reliably (Borger, page 3 paragraph 28).

Regarding claim 2, Timmons teaches the second habitat retrieves information from the first habitat (col. 9 lines 44-46).

Regarding claim 3, Timmons teaches the first habitat selects portions of the retrieved information for display based on user-input (col. 3 line 51-67).

Regarding claim 5, Timmons teaches the first habitat sends out a request for desired information to a plurality of habitats and retrieves the desired information from at least one of the habitats responding to the request (col. 9 lines 40-55).

Regarding claim 6, Timmons teaches first habitat is in communication with a plurality of habitats (col. 9 lines 40-55).

Regarding claim 7, Timmons teaches an application communicate with the first habitat for retrieving information therefrom (col. 4 lines 50-59).

Regarding claim 8, Timmons teaches the first habitat interacts with an application for performing tasks (col. 3 lines 51-64).

Regarding claim 9, Timmons teaches each of the habitats has an assigned address (col. 9 lines 44-47).

Regarding claim 10, a computer program product of claim 10 has a corresponding method of claim 1; therefore, claim 10 is rejected under the same rationale as applied to claim 1.

Regarding claim 11, Timmons teaches the second habitat retrieves information from the first habitat (col. 9 lines 44-46).

Regarding claim 12, Timmons teaches the first habitat selects portions of the retrieved information for display based on user-input (col. 3 line 51-67).

Regarding claim 13, Timmons teaches the first habitat connects directly to the second habitat for retrieving the information from the second habitat (col. 11 lines 22-24).

Regarding claim 14, Timmons teaches the first habitat sends out a request for desired information to a plurality of habitats and retrieves the desired information from at least one of the habitats responding to the request (col. 9 lines 40-55).

Regarding claim 15, Timmons teaches first habitat is in communication with a plurality of habitats (col. 9 lines 40-55).

Regarding claim 16, Timmons teaches an application communicate with the first habitat for retrieving information therefrom (col. 4 lines 50-59).

Regarding claim 17, Timmons teaches the first habitat interacts with an application for performing tasks (col. 3 lines 51-64).

Regarding claim 18, Timmons teaches each of the habitats has an assigned address (col. 9 lines 44-47).

4. Claims 4 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Timmons in view Borger in further view of Young et al. (Young) (US 2002/0130894 A1).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of teachings of Timmons and Borger does not explicitly teach a user viewing the first habitat can jump directly to the second habitat for viewing information in the second habitat. However, Young teaches a user view a web page can simply point and click on a hyperlink to call-up another web page (page 1 paragraph 2).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Timmons and Borger to include directly jumping/linking to the second habitat/web page as taught by Young because it

Art Unit: 2155

would enhance the interaction between the web browser and web pages (Young, page 1 paragraph 3).

Regarding claim 19, Timmons teaches a system for network-based information management (abstract), comprising:

logic for initiating a first habitat having markers utilized for identifying information selected by a user (col.2 lines 9-19);

logic for retrieving the information associated with the markers (col.2 lines 9-19);

logic for displaying the selected information on an information screen of the first habitat utilizing a network (col. 2 lines 1-19 and col.. 3 lines47-67);

logic for allowing a plurality of users to view the information screen of the first habitat (col. 2 lines 9-11 and col. 9 lines 41-55).

Timmons does not explicitly teach logic for allowing the first habitats to send a request to a second habitat for desired information and access one or more of the habitat for retrieving the requested information from the second habitat, the second habitat sending information matching the request directly to the first habitat; wherein a user viewing the first habitat can jump directly to the second habitat for viewing information in the second habitat.

Borger teaches allowing the first habitat to send a request to habitat for desired information and access one or more habitats responding to the request for retrieving the requested information from the habitat (i.e., the first server sends a request to a second server fro content, abstract and page 4 paragraph 46), the habitat responding to the request sending information matching the request directly to the first habitat (i.e., the

Art Unit: 2155

second server sends content having a format specified by the markup tag to the first server, page 5 paragraphs 50-52). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Timmons to include allowing the first habitat to send a request to a second habitat for desired information and access the habitat for retrieving the requested information from the habitat, the habitat sending information matching the request directly to the first habitat as taught by Borger because it would enable content to be dynamically inserted into web document quickly and reliably (Borger, page 3 paragraph 28).

Timmons does not explicitly teach a user viewing the first habitat can jump directly to the second habitat for viewing information in the second habitat. However, Young teaches a user view a web page can simply point and click on a hyperlink to call-up another web page (page 1 paragraph 2). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Timmons to include directly jumping/linking to the second habitat/web page as taught by Young because it would enhance the interaction between the web browser and web pages (Young, page 1 paragraph 3).


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oanh Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-3983. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 2:00AM - 10:30PM.

Art Unit: 2155

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

O.D  
June 15, 2005



**SALEH NAJJAR**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**